

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/665,574	09/18/2000	Daniel I. Flitcroft	032668-026	6529
21839	7590 07/29/2004		EXAM	INER
	DANE SWECKER &	CUFF, MICHAEL A		
	CE BOX 1404 RIA, VA 22313-1404	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	,		3627	
			DATE MAILED: 07/29/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

*					
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	09/665,574	FLITCROFT ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Michael Cuff	3627			
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	n appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR R THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 Clafter SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ON. FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a on. a reply within the statutory minimum of this period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI statute, cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed ty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	<u>13 May 2004</u> .				
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)□	This action is non-final.				
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-15,17-21 and 28-56 is/are pend 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-15,17-21 and 28-56 is/are reject 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and subject to restriction a	hdrawn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exa	miner.				
) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to		· ·			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the constant of the con	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docur 2. Certified copies of the priority docur 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International Bu * See the attached detailed Office action for a	ments have been received. ments have been received in A priority documents have beer ureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No received in this National Stage			
Attachment(s)					
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946) 		Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date			
Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/S Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11</u> .		nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)			

Application/Control Number: 09/665,574

Árt Unit: 3627

DETAILED ACTION

Amendment

1. Applicant's arguments, filed 5/13/04, has been received and entered. The examiners concurs with applicant that the Austin reference cannot be used because of the Irish priority dates. This action has been made final base on being necessitated by amendment from the first rejection, maile 8/18/03. IDS, filed 6/23/04, paper #11, has also been received.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-15, 17-21 and 28-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker et al. (6,163,771) in view of Nakagawa.

Walker et al. shows all of the limitations of the claims except for use-triggered deactivation.

Walker et al. shows a credit card system that includes a means for maintaining a pool of credit card numbers with identical formatting (col. 6, line 30+), assigning at least one of the numbers from the pool to be a master credit card number (col. 6, line 45+, col. 6, line 57+), randomly assigning at least one credit card number from the pool to be a limited-use number (col. 6, line 45+, col. 12, lines 8+, col. 12, lines 35+), transmitting and processing a transaction message (see figures 2 and 3a), authorizing or denying

Árt Unit: 3627

the transaction (310, figure 3a, col. 6, lines 48+), and associating the master credit card number with the limited-use credit card number in a manner that prevents discovery of the master credit card number (col. 6, lines 29+). The system includes a means for determining if a limited-use card number has been used. The limited-use credit card number could be good for only a single use (abstract) and could have a prescribed monetary value (col 6, line 25, common practice). The system maintains a queue of available limited-use credit card numbers. The system includes a means for providing an encrypted limited-use number to the user and it would be obvious to one skilled in the art that the number could be provided in a variety of manners (col 4, lines 1+)

Nakagawa teaches, figure 10, a stage in which a rental contract is terminated. When the user 106 wants to terminate a rental contract 152, he/she returns his/her rental equipment and presents his/her credit card. The rental company 100 uses the credit card presented by the user 106 so as to make a credit accounting service cancellation application 154 to the mobile communication company 102 in order to settle up expenses.

Based on the teaching of Austin, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify the Walker et al. system to incorporate the card cancellation method of Nakagawa in order to settle up expenses.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-15, 17-21 and 28-56 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 3627

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Cuff whose telephone number is (703) 308-0610. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 to 5:30. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Olszewski can be reached on (703) 308-5183. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9326. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

Michael luff 7/27/04 Michael Cuff July 27, 2004